

## REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-12 have been amended and claims 13 and 14 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendment does not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

### Claim Objections

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 3, claims 2 and 4 are objected to because of informalities. Each of claims 2 and 4 has been amended to correct the informalities. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection to claims 2 and 4 is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,774,903 issued to Burns. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In this response, independent claims 1 and 9 have each been amended to further recite: “a light guide unit comprising: an incidence surface to receive light from the lamp, and a second masking film, coated on the incidence surface, to cut off a part of ultraviolet rays emitted from the lamp unit.”

A non-limiting example of the claimed feature is shown in Fig. 6 of the present application, in which the light source includes the lamp unit 710 and the light guide plate 720.

The light guide plate 720 includes a second masking film 703 coated on an incidence surface thereof. Therefore, for example, the light source device may prevent a portion of ultraviolet rays that are emitted from the lamp unit from being supplied to the light guide plate.

In this regard, Burns does not disclose or suggest “a light guide unit comprising: an incidence surface to receive light from the lamp, and a second masking film, coated on the incidence surface, to cut off a part of ultraviolet rays emitted from the lamp unit,” as is recited in amended claim 1 of the present application. Instead, as shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, Burns discloses forming absorbing layers on an inner and outer surface of an outer surface of a glass envelope of a lamp unit, e.g., fluorescent lamp, of a light source device that does not include a light guide unit.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, independent claims 1 and 9 of the present application are distinguishable over the reference relied upon by the Examiner.

Claim 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 each depend from claim 1 of the present application. Claims 10 and 11 each depend from claim 9 of the present application. Therefore, for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 9 are distinguishable over the reference relied upon by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11 also distinguishes over the reference relied upon by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11.

**Rejection of claims 4, 8, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 4, 8, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,774,903 issued to Burns in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,748,518 issued to Lewis.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580

(CCPA 1974). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claims 4 and 8 each depend from independent claim 1 and claim 12 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above that independent claims 1 and 9 are distinguishable over the reference relied upon by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that each of dependent claims 4, 8, and 12 also distinguishes over the references relied upon by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 4, 8, and 12.

**New Claims**

In this response, claims 13 and 14 have been newly added to cover the invention from a different perspective. Since the references relied upon by the Examiner do not disclose the features recited in new claims 13 and 14, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 13 and 14 are in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Registration No. 50,114

Date: June 9, 2005

**McGUIREWOODS, LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
(703) 712-5365 (Direct Phone)  
(703) 712-5280 (Direct Fax)